IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA MARTINSBURG

AARON K. (BEY) RILEY,

Petitioner,

٧.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:07-CV-47 (BAILEY)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,

Respondents.

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
THAT "PETITION TO TRANSFER PROPERTY" BE DENIED

On this day, the above-styled matter came before this Court upon consideration of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge James E. Seibert. By Local Rule, this action was referred to Magistrate Judge Seibert for submission of a proposed report and a recommendation ("R & R"). Magistrate Judge Seibert filed his R & R on March 24, 2010 [Doc. 10]. In that filing, the magistrate judge recommended that this Court deny the Petition for Transfer of Property [Doc. 9] and dismiss the same from the docket.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b) (1) (c), this Court is required to make a *de novo* review of those portions of the magistrate judge's findings to which objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). In addition, failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of *de novo* 

review and the right to appeal this Court's Order. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Snyder v.

Ridenour, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91,

94 (4th Cir. 1984). Here, objections to Magistrate Judge Seibert's R & R were due within

fourteen (14) days of its receipt, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Fed.R.Civ.P. 72(b).

The docket reflects service was accepted on April 9, 2010. See Doc. 13. No objections

to the R & R have been filed. Accordingly, this Court will review the report and

recommendation for clear error.

Upon careful review of the report and recommendation, it is the opinion of this Court

that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation [Doc. 10] should be, and is,

hereby **ORDERED ADOPTED** for the reasons more fully stated in the magistrate judge's

report. Therefore, this Court hereby **DENIES** the Petition for Transfer of Property [Doc. 9]

and **ORDERS** the same **DISMISSED** from the docket of this Court.

It is so **ORDERED**.

The Clerk is directed to transmit copies of this Order to all counsel of record and to

mail a true copy to the *pro* se petitioner.

**DATED:** April 28, 2010.

IN PRESTON BAILEY